



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XL, 4.

WHOLE No. 160

I. THE THEORY OF THE HOMERIC CAESURA ACCORDING TO THE EXTANT REMAINS OF THE ANCIENT DOCTRINE.

The doctrine of the caesura, especially of the Homeric caesura, holds an important place both in metric and in the teaching and appreciation of Greek verse, yet there are few questions in classical scholarship about which there is more confusion, or wider difference of opinion. This is seen in the variety of reasons given for the phenomenon of caesura of the dactylic hexameter, and in the failure of each of these reasons to be entirely satisfactory. They include the following:

(1) The hexameter is too long for a rhythmical unit (*πρὸς μέγιστος*); it therefore consists of two *cola*, and the caesura marks the end of the first *colon*. This, the most commonly accepted explanation of the reason for caesura, is open to several objections. Caesura of the iambic trimeter is not to be explained thus, for this verse does not overstep the limits of a single *πρὸς μέγιστος*. Again, in melic poetry the end of a *colon* is not necessarily marked by a word-end, which is recognized as indispensable for caesura by all ancient, and most modern, writers on metric. Furthermore, the acceptance of this explanation has led to unnecessarily rigid conclusions, some modern metricians arguing for only one caesura in the hexameter, and that always in the third foot. But it is perfectly natural, and even desirable, that the constituent *cola* should be of varying length, and that occasionally a hexameter should contain not two, but three, *cola*. The strongest objection, however, lies in the fact that the doctrine of the *πρὸς μέγιστος* was established

in the attempt to explain the laws of *melic* poetry. Caesura, on the other hand, is concerned chiefly with the recited trimeter and with the hexameter, which, long before the time of Aristoxenus, had ceased to be sung. The Homeric hexameter is a distinct genre of verse, and we have no means of knowing that the principle of the *πρὸς μέγιστος* satisfactorily explains the phenomena of its rhythm. In all probability, as we shall see later, Aristoxenus knew nothing about caesura.¹

(2) The verse composed of a maximum length of 17 syllables is too long to be recited comfortably in a single breath.² Doubtless this is true in a certain sense. It does not, however, explain why the caesura should be found only in the third foot and not in any other possible place within the verse, nor does it bar the recognition of many caesuraless verses—which is contrary to the prevailing doctrine—for it is certainly possible, and sometimes even desirable, to pronounce a phrase as long as the hexameter in a single breath. It is to be noticed in passing that this explanation makes caesura a slight *pause*, as the reason given above makes it a musical *hold*, and both without regard to the thought of the verse.

(3) The hexameter is too long for a single syntactical unit.³ We must postpone the discussion of this statement until we take up the meaning of caesura.

(4) The hexameter, like all verses of six feet, has a tendency to break up into groups of 3 + 3, or 2 + 2 + 2 feet. "Care was taken to counteract this and preserve unity by arranging the words so that in general their divisions and those of the sense should not coincide with places at which the meter of the music was likely to break up" (Verrall in Whibley, *Companion to Greek Studies*,¹ 625). The use of caesura as a means of binding the verse together has been pointed out also by Lehrs (Aristarchus,² 414) and by Professor M. W. Humphreys (Trans. Amer. Philol. Assn. X 26). The frequency with which

¹ On the hexameter as a variety of verse distinct from lyric, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griech. Lit.* 9; for the bearing of this distinction on the doctrine of caesura, White, *Verse of Greek Comedy*, 52. Professor Goodell makes some excellent remarks on the caesura of the trimeter in *Class. Phil.*, I (1906), 148 f.

² Wilamowitz, l. c.; cf. van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, 3.

³ Christ, *Metrik*,¹ 186.

the so-called bucolic diaeresis occurs in Homeric verse indicates that this principle must not be applied too strictly.

(5) The hexameter is a compound verse, made up of two shorter verses; the caesura is a survival of the end of the first short verse. This—an entirely modern doctrine—rests upon insufficient evidence, and must be regarded as unproven.⁴

The difference of opinion with regard to the reason for caesura has resulted in a failure to agree on a satisfactory definition of the term. A century ago, Gottfried Hermann, the father of Greek metric in modern times, gave three possible meanings of caesura:⁵

I. Caesura occurs where a word ends within a verse; hence there are as many caesurae as there are word-endings in the verse.

II. In a stricter sense caesura is found only where a rhythmical phrase ends with a word.

III. Since in reciting one must also pay attention to the meaning of the words, the completion of the thought must determine the choice between two or more possible caesurae.

These three statements characterize the three distinct classes into which the great body of modern doctrine about the caesura is divided, according as emphasis is laid upon the metrical, rhythmical or logical nature of the *τομή*. Of course considerable eclecticism is found, but speaking generally, all modern metrists belong to one or other of these three classes.

The metrical theory of caesura, first upheld in modern times by Spitzner (*de versu heroico*, 1816, 3 f.), has the greatest number of adherents. It is the *via media*, and affords room for straying on either side. Hence metrical caesurists are inclined more or less to recognize the value of caesura as a musical hold, or as a logical pause. On the other hand, the supporters of the rhythmical, as well as of the logical, doctrine, are ever and anon constrained by the facts to wander into the neutral area of the metrical caesura.

The rhythmical or musical definition was maintained to the exclusion of the other two, first in modern times by Apel

⁴ Cf. K. Witte in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie*, VIII (1913), 2241 ff.

⁵ *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (1816), 32 ff.

(Metrik, 1814, 336). He has been followed by Lehrs (Aristarchus,² 1865, 414, cf. 409); W. Meyer, *Zur Geschichte des griechischen und lateinischen Hexameters*, 1884, 1000; A. Engelbrecht, *Die Caesuren des Hexameters*, in *Serta Harteliana*, 1896, 311, cf. 307, 308; and many of the French writers on metric, e. g., Riemann et Dufour, *Traité de Rythmique et de Métrique grecques*, 1898, chap. I, and especially Masqueray, *Traité de Métrique grecque*, 1899, 49.

The logical caesurists include as protagonists, beside Hermann himself, W. Christ, *Metrik*,¹ 1879, 184 ff., and T. D. Seymour, *Harvard Studies*, III, 1892, 91-129.

One of the most recent, as well as one of the best, discussions of caesura (by the late Professor J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 1912) is decidedly eclectic in its position. The author admits that caesura belongs to recited, and not to melic, verse. Nevertheless, he explains the necessity of caesura by reference to the purely rhythmical doctrine of the *ποὺς μέγιστος* (pp. 7, 152). He likewise recognizes the importance of the definition of caesura given by the Anonymus Ambrosianus (cited below, p. 359), which makes a pause in sense the essential requisite of caesura. Yet in spite of this, he admits caesura at the end of a word where the thought cannot by any reasonable understanding be complete. His discussion has all the disadvantages of the eclectic position, and by no means settles the question. Thus a century of research and criticism has left us still uncertain what value we are to give to caesura in the oral rendering of Homeric verse, for it has failed to make clear the nature of the pause which caesura is said to be.

To illustrate this uncertainty let us take an example, selected from the *Iliad* almost at random (Z 514-516):

καρχαλῶν, ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον· αἶψα δ' ἔπειτα
Ἔκτορα διὸν ἔτετμεν ἀδελφεόν, εὖτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλεν
στρέψασθ' ἐκ χώρης, ὅθι ἦ δάριζε γυναικί.

All the rhythmical, and most of the metrical, caesurists would make a pause after δέ in vs. 514, and after ἔτετμεν in vs. 515, and even Professor White's theory requires a 'secondary pause' in these two places. The present writer and, I am inclined to think, most modern readers of Homer, would make no pause in the oral rendering of these lines, not even at the end of the

verse, which is not required by the sense, and indicated, here at least, by punctuation. The doctrine of caesura, however, as generally understood, stands in the way. For if caesura is a pause, and if there is always a caesura (even a secondary caesura) in the third foot, or if not in the third, at least in the fourth foot, we must make a slight pause after *δέ* and after *ἔτερον*. We must admit, therefore, that the work of the last one hundred years has left the doctrine of caesura in an unsatisfactory form. This is due largely to the failure to consider the date at which the doctrine came into existence in ancient times, and the widely differing age of the statements about caesura which have come down to us from antiquity. A review of the extant remains of the ancient doctrine may therefore help to remove some of our uncertainty, and lay the foundation for a better understanding of the phenomenon.

Τομή of the verse was probably not recognized either by this name or as a fact until after the beginning of the Roman empire. Certainly Aristotle gives no indication that he knew of its existence.⁶ Whether Aristoxenus mentioned the *τομαί* cannot of course be determined. The probabilities are that he did not, for he was interested rather in melic verse in which, according to the ancient doctrine, caesura is of little importance. Moreover, the fact that the so-called bucolic caesura received its

⁶ Some modern scholars cite as evidence that in the time of Aristotle the so-called feminine caesura was known, the following passage from the *Metaphysics* (1093a): *βαλνται* (sc. τὸ ἔπος) ἐν μὲν τῷ δεξιῷ ἐννέα συλλαβαῖς, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀριστερῷ ὀκτώ, "In scanning the hexameter there are nine syllables on the right, and eight on the left." But, as the present writer has shown, both the statement of the scholiast (Alexander, 832, 33, Brandis) and all the evidence make it plain that the Pythagoreans whom Aristotle is quoting meant by *δεξιόν* the *first* part of the verse, and that they were calling attention to the fact that there were more syllables in the first three feet of the verse than in the last three, and were commenting upon the number of syllables in each half (C. P. XI 458 ff. To the modern metricians cited there should be added van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium* 13 f.). Usener, *Altgriechischer Versbau*, 42, who followed Bonitz, *Comment. in Arist. Metaph.*, p. 594 f., in taking *δεξιόν* to mean the *second* part of the verse, used the passage in support of the theory that the feminine caesura represents the end of the first of the two short verses from which the hexameter was derived. The investigations of the past generation have shown the weakness of the other arguments of Usener; see K. Witte, *op. cit.* 2242.

name from its frequency in bucolic poetry indicates that the doctrine of caesura was developed after Alexandrian times. Finally, Varro, who is thought to have been familiar with Greek metric and who is the first extant authority to mention the importance of a word-end within the verse, apparently made the discovery for himself.⁷ That the doctrine of caesura was not known in Varro's day is further indicated by the silence of Dionysius Hal. In the *De Comp. Verb.*, 26, Dionysius pays considerable attention to the rhythm of both melic and recitative poetry as resembling that of prose, and especially to the variety of rhythms produced by the differing length of the grammatical *κῶλα* and *κόμματα*, but makes no mention of *τομή*. It is hard to believe that if he had known of the theory of caesura he would have failed to mention it. The *terminus post quem* may therefore be placed somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era. The *terminus ante quem* is about one hundred years later. The first Greek definition of *τομή* which has come down to us is that of Aristides Quint., who probably belongs to the third century, A. D. But the doctrine must have been formulated more than a century earlier. We are told by Choeroboscus (Hephaestion, 229, 15, Consbruch) that Hephaestion, who is thought to have lived in the second century, A. D., mentioned the caesurae of the trimeter, and Terentianus Maurus, who was familiar with Greek metric, and who discusses caesura in detail, is now generally assigned to the same century. Finally, Hermogenes, a younger contemporary of Marcus Aurelius, mentions the *τομαί* without comment,⁸ showing that the doctrine was well-established by about 150 A. D. We conclude that the doctrine of caesura was formulated during the first hundred years of the present era—long after the great age of Alexandrian scholarship.

Our earliest extant Greek exposition of the doctrine, that of Arist. Quint., is as follows (51 f., M.):—*τομαί δὲ εὐπρεπεῖς αὐτοῦ, πρώτη μὲν ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας εἰς συλλαβήν, ἣ καὶ διπλασιαζομένη ποιεῖ τὸ*

⁷ Cf. Aul. Gell. XVIII 15, M. etiam Varro in libris disciplinarum scripsit, obseruasse sese in uersu hexametro, quod omnimodo quintus semipes uerbum finiret et quod priores quinque semipedes aequae magnam uim haberent in efficiendo uersu atque alii posteriores septem, idque ipsum ratione quadam geometrica fieri disserit.

⁸ Hermogenes, *περὶ ἰδεῶν* 390, 21, Rabe, *μέτρων διαφόρους τομαίς*.

ἐλεγείον δευτέρα ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας < εἰς δισύλλαβον >.⁹ τρίτη δὲ ἢ μετὰ τρεῖς εἰς συλλαβήν. τετάρτη κατ' ἐνίους, τέσσαρες δάκτυλοι . ἢ, ὅπερ ἄμεινον, τέταρτος τροχαῖος. ἢ γὰρ εἰς ὅμοια μέρη διαίρεσις μᾶλλον ἢ τομή καλεῖται. τομή δέ ἐστι μόριον μέτρον τὸ πρῶτον ἐν αὐτῷ λόγον ἀπαρτίζον, ὑπὲρ δύο πόδας εἰς ἀνόμοια μέρη διαιροῦν τὸ μέτρον. "The appropriate *τομαί* of the dactylic hexameter are (1) the *τομή* which ends after two feet and one syllable; by doubling this *τομή* the elegiac verse is obtained. (2) The *τομή* which ends after two feet and two syllables. (3) The *τομή* which ends after three feet and one syllable. (4) Four dactyls or *what is preferable, the fourth trochee*, for the *τομή* which divides the verse into similar parts is called diaeresis, rather than *τομή*. *Τομή* is that portion of a measure which is formed by the first word-end after the second foot, and divides the measure into dissimilar portions."

Since this discussion of caesura plays a most important rôle in the modern doctrine, it is necessary to point out some of its characteristics:—(1) *Τομή* has its original meaning of 'segment,' rather than 'end of a segment.' (2) No names are given to any of the *τομαί*; the adjective 'bucolic' is not applied to the *τομή* which consists of four dactyls. (3) No examples are given. (4) The term diaeresis is preferred to *τομή* for the segment of the verse which is formed by a word-end after the fourth foot. (Aristides is the only one of all our ancient sources to use this term, which has found a wide acceptance among modern scholars.) (5) The *τομαί* are four in number, but there is uncertainty with regard to the fourth, some metricians holding it to be the first four dactyls, that is, the 'bucolic diaeresis,' while in the opinion of Aristides it is better to regard the 'fourth trochaic' as the fourth *τομή*. This is the most unsatisfactory feature of the whole passage. Evidently Aristides derived his doctrine from at least two sources, one of which held that the caesura which we call the bucolic diaeresis was the fourth *τομή*, while the other, because it considered that the function of *τομή* was to divide the verse into dissimilar portions, rejected the bucolic diaeresis in favor of the fourth trochaic. It is easy to see that the first source is the better of the two. We may note in passing that Aristides mentions it first. But far more

⁹ So Meibom; Jahn substitutes *εἰς τροχαῖον*.

important than this is the consideration that the observed facts with regard to the place of word-ends—not to mention pauses in thought—in the heroic hexameter debar the fourth trochaic from being considered a caesura in almost any sense in which the word may be taken. In Homer a word-end after the fourth trochee is avoided more than at any other place in the verse, and there is never even a slight pause in the sense. On the other hand, we know that the bucolic diaeresis was a favorite caesura. A word-end occurs at the end of the fourth foot in about 60% of all the verses of the Homeric poems, and a pause in thought—often a full stop—very frequently. This consideration alone should make us extremely cautious about giving great value to Aristides' exposition of the doctrine (including the statement that the function of caesura is to divide the verse into dissimilar portions).

This slighting of the bucolic diaeresis in favor of the fourth trochaic is likewise found in Terentianus Maurus, 1695 f. (Gram. Lat. VI 376), who seems to be following the second source of Aristides, for he does not mention B,¹⁰ and he uses the words *quartus trochaeus* to describe the fourth caesura. The weakness of his position with regard to this caesura is apparent from his difficulty in finding an example—which is so great that he is obliged to construct a verse of his own (1700 ff.) :—

*exemplar eius tale confici potest,
quae pax longa remiserat, arma novare parabant:
quartus trochaeus arma fit, rarum est tamen.*

Marius Victorinus agrees closely with Terentianus in discussing the *tomae*, which he calls *incisiones*, but never *caesurae*. He regards 4T as the fourth *incisio*, and cites as an example the verse constructed by Terent. (65, 25, Keil). But he was likewise familiar with the tradition represented by the first source

¹⁰ For the sake of brevity the writer, following White, Verse of Greek Comedy, 152, will use the following abbreviations for the different caesurae: P = penthemimeral; T = trochaic (the so-called feminine caesura); H = hephthemimeral; B = bucolic diaeresis; 4T = fourth trochaic, and Tr. = triemimeral (this is a word of modern coinage; trithemimeral is, of course, a monster of word-formation, but it was current during the last century. The ancients, with the exception of Ausonius (see below, p. 352), never refer to a caesura after the first syllable of the second foot).

of Arist., for after stating that the heroic verse must have either P, T, H or 4T, he adds (65, 29, K.) non numquam autem evenit ut in eodem versu plures incisiones, id est penthemimeren et hephthemimeren et eam quae quarto *pede* [caesura] partem orationis terminat, quam bucolicen Graeci dicunt, reperiamus, ut

arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris

With this passage should be compared p. 114, 17, K., where Mar. Vict. calls the dactylic tetrameter either a verse or the *third tome* of the heroic verse, tetrameter sive versus sive hexametri heroi tome tertia. In both of the passages just cited Mar. Vict. fails to agree with Arist. in the reason which he gives for the distinction between B and the other tomæ. He regards B as a caesura—as Arist. did not—but not as one of those which are essential to the heroic verse. It may be that he is trying to harmonize the conflicting theories. There is some likelihood, however, that in the last passage quoted (114, 17, K.) he is following a still different tradition, according to which there were only three *τομαί*, P, H, and B. This tradition is preserved in a fragment of Juba (second century, A. D.): sunt praeterea heroi versus, quibus et Homerus et Theocritus facile usi sunt, qui bucolici dicuntur, quorum caesura non penthemimeres nec hephthemimeres, id est in secundo et dimidio vel tertio et dimidio pede, sed in quarto . . . huius exemplum est

dic age, dic mihi † bove Liburnica, qui colis arva.¹¹

Since Juba mentions Homer and Theocritus, we may infer that his source was Greek.

From the sources just cited it is seen that prior to the third century, A. D., no more than four caesurae were recognized in any one formulation of the doctrine, that these four were either P, T, H, B, or P, T, H, 4T, and that in the tradition handed down by Juba there may not have been more than three, P, H, B. As between the first two groups the weight is in favor of the first (P, T, H, B). Indeed it seems probable that 4T was substituted for B by the second source of Arist. because of the notion that a *τομή* was a rhythmical *κόμμα*.¹² But however

¹¹ In the Frag. Bobiense, Gram. Lat. VI 623, 14.

¹² Cf. Atil. Fort. 282, 27, K., Colon est pars, sive partes versus integris pedibus impletæ . . . comma pars versus sive partes imperfectæ. Cf. Beda, 246, 19, K.

this may have been, the confusion resulting from the two differing sources produced in Byzantine times the doctrine of five *τομαί*, P, T, H, 4T, B.¹³ No other caesura is mentioned by any ancient authority, with a single exception.¹⁴ Ausonius (fourth century, A. D.) writes in the introduction to his *Cento Nuptialis* (*Id.* XIII), *diffinduntur per caesuras omnes . . . aut post dactylum atque semipedem*.¹⁵ That there may be other caesurae is recognized by Priscian (460, 12, K.) and by Joannes Sic. (*Rhet. Graec.* VI 488, Walz), but these are not included among the *ἐνπρεπείς τομαί*. By far the greater number of ancient sources recognize only P, T, H, B. These are the unknown author of the *Tractatus Wolfenbüttel* (*Gram. Lat.* VI 645, 25 f.), which is held by Strähler to be, but for the corruption of the text, our best Latin authority on the caesura; Max. Vict., 240, 1, K.; Anon. Ambros. (the Great Anonymus), 215, Studemund; Anon. Ambros. Q. 158, Studemund; also a number of other Byzantine treatises: Ps.-Plutarch, *de metris*, 2; Ps.-Hephaestion, *zur Jacobsmühlen*, 88; Helias Mon., 172, Stude-

¹³ Strähler, *de caesuris versus Homerici*, Cap. I, Breslau (1889), 26, who cites these treatises: Ps.-Hephaestion, *zur Jacobsmühlen*, 50; Isaac Mon., Bachmann, *Anec. Graec.*, II 186; Ps.-Draco, Hermann, 126; Anon. Ambros. Q, Studemund, 159; Anon. Chisianus, Mangelsdorf, 9.

¹⁴ The author of the late treatise in Ps.-Hephaestion, 30 (= *zur Jacobsmühlen*, Diss. Argentor. X 274) mentions a caesura after the first syllable of the fifth foot, and calls this *βουκολική*, but he was trying to account for the faulty example of the bucolic diaeresis (Γ 308) which is given in several late definitions of caesura. See the article referred to in Note 15.

¹⁵ Engelbrecht, *op. cit.* 293, cites also Hermogenes, *περὶ ἰδεῶν*, 294, 18, Rabe, where the reference seems to be not to caesura but to a pause in the sense (see below, p. 362), and Priscian, *Gram. Lat.* III 460, 14, *quarta enim [sc. caesura] bucolica magis passio est, sicut hemiepes* (G; hemipes, C; semipes, S) *et quarta trochaica et quae inveniuntur per singulos pedes*. Engelbrecht adopts the reading of C, and by inserting *tertius* makes Priscian refer to the triemimeral. But Keil's reading, that of G, *hemiepes* (i. e., *ἡμίεπες*, the forbidden caesura after the third foot), seems clearly the best. It is easy to see how the copyist finding the reading *hemipes*, a simple corruption of *hemiepes*, should have corrected this to *semipes*. On the other hand, if he had before him *semipes*, he would not have been likely to write either *hemipes* or *hemiepes*. That the ancients noticed the presence of a word-end at the middle of the verse is shown by the present writer in an article on *Βουκολικόν* which is to be published in C. P. XV.

mund; Joannes Sic., op. cit. 487; Dion. Thrax, Suppl. III, 123, Uhlig.

The order in which the different caesurae are mentioned throws little light upon the ancient doctrine. There are two possible arrangements, (1) according to the order of importance, and (2) in the order in which they occur in the verse. Aristides and Diomedes alone adopt the second order, P, T, H, B (or P, T, H, 4T). All the rest, with two exceptions,¹⁶ place H before T. (P, H, T, B, or P, H, T, 4T, B.) This is natural for Latin writers, since T is not frequent in the Latin hexameter. But it is strange that all the Greek treatises after Arist., with the single exception of the Great Anonymus, should mention H before T. Apparently for some reason P and H were thought to differ in some way from T. This view finds some support in the evidence from the names of the caesurae. P and H offer no variations from the terms, *πενθημιμερής* (*πενθημιμερίς*) and *ἑφθημιμερής* (*ἑφθημιμερίς*) or their Latin equivalents. B shows somewhat greater variety. As we have seen, Arist. alone calls it, not a caesura, but a diaeresis. The others call it *τετραποδία* (Anon. Ambros. Q. 158 f., Studemund), tetrapodia (Diomedes, 497, 5 ff., K.), tetrametra (Marius Plotius, 502, 10, K.), or else *βουκολική* (*τομή*) or bucolice tome.¹⁷ T in some respects stands quite apart in its nomenclature from the three caesurae already mentioned. Its name is never that of a *μέτρον μέτρον*. One writer besides Arist. (Atil. Fort., 284, 28, K.), describes it, without naming it. The rest use *τρίτος τροχάιος*, *κατὰ τρίτον τροχάιον*, *τρίτη τροχαϊκή* (*τομή*) or the Latin equivalents. 4T shows much the same variation in its names. The bearing of this terminology upon the question of the origin of the doctrine of caesura will be discussed later (pp. 364 f.).

Of the five caesurae mentioned by the ancient metricians (P, T, H, 4T, B) 4T is clearly of the least importance. It is not

¹⁶ Priscian, 460, 13, Keil (T, P, H), and the Great Anonymus (H, P, T, B). These exceptions to the usual order seem to have been due to accident or caprice, and apparently have no significance.

¹⁷ Mar. Vict., 65, 33, K., alone of Latin writers, calls this caesura a *divisio*. In doing so he may be following the second source of Aristides, but it is possible that he is using the word in a more general sense, cf. 64, 34, K., *qui herous hexameter merito nuncupabitur, si competenti divisionum ratione dirimatur*.

mentioned by many of the better sources; where it is mentioned no satisfactory evidence is given, and the facts with regard to Homeric versification are all against it. B will be reserved for separate discussion. The three remaining *τομαί* (P, T, H) are mentioned as caesurae without reservation by practically all the ancient sources.¹⁸ Of these the Latin writers seem to have regarded P and H as the chief caesurae: Mar. Vict., 65, 15, K., erunt igitur hae (i. e. P and H) duae tomæ principales, ut dictum est, heroici versus incisiones, quibus similiter et iambici versus trimetri dividuntur. sed his in heroico duo aliae accedunt. nam si harum neutram inveneris, tertium trochaeum conquies; Ter. Maur., 1685, horum (i. e., P and H) si nihil est, spectane forte trochaeus sit tertius. This is sound doctrine for the Latin hexameter, but seems nevertheless to have been due to Greek sources: both writers use Greek terms in describing caesura, and T is placed after H in all our extant Greek sources except Arist. To this fact is perhaps due the failure of modern metricians to recognize until late in the last century the slightly greater importance of the feminine caesura in the Homeric poems.¹⁹

The bucolic caesura was regarded as differing somewhat from the other caesurae. This is shown in many ways. Arist. calls it not a *τομή*, but a diaeresis. Terentianus fails to mention it. Mar. Vict. in the passage in which he is following Terent. mentions B only as a secondary caesura, 65, 30, K. Later (114, 17, K.), in discussing the tetrameter, he calls B the third incisio of the heroic hexameter, thus contradicting himself.²⁰ All the other metricians treat B as a caesura, but often indicate that it is not exactly like the others: it is characteristic rather of Greek pastoral poetry than of the heroic hexameter; it is 'ornatus causa addita' (Maximus Vict., 240, 9, K.); it is 'magis passio' (Priscian, 460, 14, K.), and finally, as will be shown later, it seems to have been regarded from the very beginning as a pause

¹⁸ Juba omits T (see above, p. 351), and Atil. Fort. 284, 25 f., K., fails to mention H and B.

¹⁹ Cf. Seymour, Trans. Amer. Philol. Assn. XVI (1885), 30 ff.

²⁰ He likewise errs in saying that Theocritus, with three or four exceptions, uses this caesura regularly. Clearly he had not read Theocritus, but is simply quoting, perhaps rather carelessly, from one of his sources.

in the sense to a very much greater extent than the other caesurae.

Our ancient sources differ widely in respect to the meaning of caesura. That it is ever regarded as marking the end of a rhythmical or musical *colon* is not entirely clear. The evidence is confined largely to what we have seen reason to believe was the second source of Arist. The latter belonged to the *rhythmici*, and while he treats of the *τομαί* in the metrical part of his treatise, the fact that he describes *τομή* as a *μόριον μέτρον* may indicate that he, or his source, felt the rhythmical, rather than the metrical, force of caesura, and that he was following the teaching of Aristoxenus that the *πὸς μέγιστος* in the hexameter cannot contain more than sixteen *χρόνοι πρώτοι*. But his failure to give examples of the caesurae leaves us in doubt.²¹ Mar. Vict. likewise may refer to the rhythmical doctrine when he says (64, 32, K.) *incisiones etiam versuum, quas Graeci τομάς vocant, ante omnia in hexametro heroo necessario observandae sunt* (omnis enim versus in duo cola formandus est).

By far the greater number of our ancient sources determine caesura solely by the ending of a word, without regard either to rhythmical theory or to the thought of the verse. The following represent the Latin metricians:

Atil. Fort. 284, 25, K., *optimus habetur, cuius prima caesura penthemimerim habet orationis parte finitam, ut*

arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris.

Frag. Sangall. (Gram. Lat. VI 638, 9), *penthemimeres est syllaba catalectica, quae post duos pedes complet partem orationis. simili modo hephthemimeres est syllaba quae post tertium pedem partem orationis complet, ut hic,*

arma virumque cano Troiae.

Frag. Wolfenbüttel (Gram. Lat. VI 645, 26), *penthemimeres caesura fit, quotiens post duos pedes syllaba remanens partem terminat orationis.*

Diomedes, 497, 11, K., *penthemimeres est semiquinaria, ubi post duos pedes et unam syllabam pars orationis expletur.*

Likewise all the Greek treatises after Arist., except the Great

²¹ There is no evidence whatsoever for the inference of Engelbrecht, op. cit., 298, that Arist. regarded *τομή* as having anything to do with a pause in sense.

Anonymus. These, some fourteen or fifteen in number, belong to the Byzantine age and are full of errors. Still, the fact that all agree in making a word-end the sole requisite for caesura, indicates that this was the earlier doctrine.²² The following is a specimen of the Byzantine treatise:—

Anon. Ambros. Q (Studemund, Anec. Var. I 158),²³ καὶ πενθημμερὴς δὲ λέγεται, ὅτι τῶν πέντε τὸ ἥμισυ ἔχει, τουτέστι δύο πόδας καὶ μίαν συλλαβὴν, οἷον

Ἄτρείδη, ποῖον.

ἐφθημμερὴς δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν μετὰ τοὺς τρεῖς πόδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβὴ ἀπαρτιζούσα εἰς μέρος λόγου · καὶ λέγεται ἐφθημμερὴς ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἥμισυ, οἷον

Ἄτρείδη, ποῖόν σε ἔπος.

κτλ., the same verse (Δ 350 = Ξ 83) being used to illustrate the four caesurae, P, H, T, B, even though this brings the masculine caesura before the enclitic σε. In a similar way the first verse of the Aeneid is used to illustrate P and H (by Maximus Victorinus) and B (by Marius Victorinus). This is good evidence that no pause in sense was thought necessary in order to have caesura.

The doctrine that caesura is a pause in the thought was much less widely held in ancient times. A consideration of the passages which support this view of caesura may help us to gain some idea of its origin. The first metrician who mentions a pause in sense as one of the requisites of caesura is Mar. Vict. (Aphthonius). In one of the two passages from which

²² Further evidence is found in Hephaestion XV 9 (52, 20, Consbruch): δὲ δὲ τὸ ἐλεγείον τέμνεσθαι πάντως καθ' ἕτερον (καθ' ἕκαστον, N; κατὰ πρότερον has been conjectured) τῶν πενθημμερῶν· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔσται πεπλημμελημένον, οἷον τὸ Καλλιμάχου,

ιερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκουρίδew γενεή.

Τέμνεσθαι cannot refer to the end of a musical *colon*, for the vs. which he cites as example of a faulty elegiac might be divided rhythmically into two *cola*; nor can it refer to a pause in sense, for while a word ends with the penthemimeres, i. e., the first half of the verse, almost invariably, a pause in sense at this point is by no means the rule. Hence Hephaestion must mean that the elegiac verse must be 'cut' by a word-end after two and one-half feet—and it is but a short step from τέμνεσθαι to τομή. This is the interpretation of the scholiast: Διοσκουρίδew · ἡ γὰρ τομή τοῦ πρώτου πενθημμεροῦς οὐκ ἀπῆρτισεν εἰς μέρος λόγου. λήγει γὰρ εἰς τὸ ΔΙΟΣ· τὸ δὲ ὄλον μέρος εἰς τὸ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΑΕΩ.

²³ This treatise follows the better tradition of the four *romai*.

citations have already been made (64, 31-66, 3; 114, 17-115, 4, K.), there is repeated reference to the completion of the thought. Unfortunately the verses which are used as illustrations contradict the statements and so detract greatly from their value. The two passages may be summarized as follows:—

(1) The penthemimeral is formed by a word-end; by doubling P we obtain the pentameter,²⁴ e. g.,

quam Juno fertur quam Juno fertur.

The second *τομή* is the hephthemimeral, quae tribus pedibus emensis adicit syllabam *completque sensum* quacumque orationis particula, e. g.,

Quam Juno fertur terris.

nam post tres pedes suprema RIS syllaba *sensum complet*. These are the principal tomæ. But there are two others, for if you find neither P nor H, look for T, which is the penthemimeres with the addition of a syllable, e. g.,

Infandum, regina, (jubes renovare dolorem),

for GINA is a trochee in the third foot. BES autem syllaba et sensum superioris coli integrat, ut fiat hephthemimeres, et sequentis pedis initium inducit. [This statement is most unsatisfactory. After saying that T may be found in a verse in which neither P nor H occur, he cites as an example of T a verse in which he admits that the end of the first *colon* is found at H. Again, he says nothing of a pause in sense at T, where there is a slight pause in his example, but states that the sense of the hephthemimeral *colon* ending with 'jubes,' is complete, which is not true according to the normal interpretation of the words.] 4T (a rare caesura) is much like T. Every heroic hexameter must have one of these four caesurae (P, H, T, 4T). It sometimes happens that in the same verse will be found P, H, and B, e. g.,

Arma virumque cano Troiae qui primus ab oris.

nam IAE QUI, pes in verso quartus, eam divisionem [i. e., *δαίρεσιν*—another indication that Marius is following one of the sources of Arist., but see note 17, p. 353] explicat, quam

²⁴ Note the closeness with which this statement follows that of Arist. (see above, p. 348).

bucolicen vocari dictum est, sub qua quattuor pedum *sensus impletur* [again there is no pause in sense where Marius says the sense is complete, i. e., at the bucolic diaeresis].

(2) In the second passage (114, 17 ff., K.) P and H are merely mentioned, while B is described at some length: *tertia est ea, quam βουκολικήν appellant, quae quarto pede semper sensum claudente distinguitur* ideoque a Graecis sic appellatur, ut ante duos ultimos quarto pede terminet aut partem orationis *aut sensum*, quam legem per omne opus sui carminis Theocritus Syracusanus exceptis tribus aut quattuor ferme versibus custodit. The phrase *semper sensum claudente* in this passage suggests the possibility that a pause in the thought was first noticed at the bucolic diaeresis and later transferred to the doctrine of the other caesurae. Certainly Mar. Vict. is an eclectic, at least, for he regards caesura (1) as being determined by a word-end, (2) as being marked at least to a slight extent by a pause in sense and (3) as marking the end of a *colon* (cf. above, p. 355). The Wolfenbüttel treatise (Gram. Lat. VI 645) agrees with Mar. Vict. in giving us some reason to believe that B was determined by a pause in sense to a greater extent than any of the other caesurae, for while, according to this treatise, P, T and H are determined solely by the ending of a word, "tetarte bucolicon²⁵ fit, cum in quarta regione pars orationis *cum fine sensus* dactylo terminatur, his exemplis,

degeneres animos timor arguit, heu quibus ille,
nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia solus."

The only clear statement that caesura in general is determined solely by a distinct pause in the thought is found in the Great Anonymus (Studemund, Anec. Var. I 215, 23-216, 12). The date of this treatise is uncertain. Strähler calls attention to the rhetorical style and the use of *συναπολήγειν*, which is not found elsewhere before the time of Philostratus. It may be added that the writer is a Christian (p. 230, 9 f.). But although

²⁵ That is *βουκολικῶν*, according to some scholars. In view of the second example, however, which contains no B, but has a word-end in the exact middle of the verse, it seems probable that the unknown writer confused the bucolic diaeresis with the *βουκολικὸν ἔπος*. See the present writer's discussion of this term in C. P. XV 54-60.

the author must be placed perhaps as late as early Byzantine times, his exposition of the doctrine is the most consistent of all that have come down to us. The fourth trochaic is not mentioned; there is no ambiguity, or at most only a slight one (in the definition of T), and the examples are all, without exception, excellent. The only criticism which may be made is that H is mentioned before T. The whole passage is worth citing:

χρή δὲ ἡμῶς μὴ μόνον τῆς ἀκριβείας τῶν μέτρων ἀντέχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς καλουμένης ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τομῆς. τομὴ δὲ τῶν στίχων ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὁ δεικνὺς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἔπους διάνοιαν στιγμῆν ἐπιτηδεῖως λαμβάνουσιν. διαφορὰς δὲ ἔχει τέσσαρας ἡ τομὴ· ἐφθημμερῇ τε καὶ πενθημμερῇ καὶ τρίτον τροχαῖον καὶ τετάρτην βουκολικὴν.

ἐφθημμερῆς μὲν καλεῖται τομὴ, ἥτις μετὰ τρεῖς πόδας καὶ συλλαβὴν τέλειον ἔχει τὸ νόημα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδευεν δ' ὁ γέρων, καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ.

ὁ ἐστὶν τῶν ἐπτά τὸ ἥμισυ.

πενθημμερῆς δὲ ἐστὶν, ἥτις μετὰ δύο πόδας καὶ συλλαβὴν τέλειον ἔχει τὸ νόημα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος.

ὁ ἐστὶ τῶν πέντε τὸ ἥμισυ.

τρίτος δὲ τροχαῖός ἐστιν ἡ ἔχουσα τὸν πόδα τὸν τρίτον εἰς τροχαῖον συναπολήγοντα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε.

τετάρτη δὲ ὑπάρχει βουκολικὴ ἡ ἔχουσα τὸ νόημα εἰς τέταρτον πόδα πάντως [cf. semper in the passage cited from Mar. Vict. above, p. 358] ἀπαρτιζόμενον, οἶον

οὐρήας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπώχετο.

καὶ πάλιν

βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων.

ταύτῃ δὲ τῇ τομῇ πάντες οἱ τὰ βουκολικὰ ποιήματα γράψαντες ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον²⁶ χρησάμενοι φαίνονται· ὅθεν καὶ τὴν κλήσιν ἡ τομὴ ταύτην ἐδέξατο, ἀπὸ τῶν χρησαμένων τὴν προσηγορίαν λαβοῦσα.

It is clear that the doctrine of the metrical caesura (i. e. caesura as formed by the end of a word without reference to the sense) has no recognition in the Great Anonymus, with the

²⁶ Note the moderation of this statement in comparison with that of Mar. Vict. (see above, p. 354, note 20).

possible exception of the feminine caesura, where the omission of 'completion of the thought' seems to have been an oversight. And yet some modern metricians, e. g., Engelbrecht²⁷ and White,²⁸ while giving prominence to this definition of caesura, have so arranged their theory as to admit caesura where there is no real pause in the thought—certainly not sufficient for punctuation. This seems to be not only unjustifiable, but altogether unnecessary. The more probable solution of the conflict between the rhetorical and the metrical definitions of caesura seems to lie in supposing that there were two distinct doctrines, that the Anonymus represents a different source from that of most of the other metricians, and that he is almost alone in this, although we have seen possible indications of this source in Mar. Vict. and in the Wolfenbüttel treatise. We may even hazard a conjecture as to the origin of this new doctrine. It seems to have come partly from the observation that in the Greek bucolic poetry a pause in sense,²⁹ completion of the thought, anaphora, etc., are often found at the end of the fourth foot. This observation, be it noted, belongs not to metric, but to rhetoric. We have strong evidence that this view of caesura as a pause in the thought had its origin in the rhetorical (and possibly grammatical) studies in the early Greek hexameter poetry.

The first passage of importance is Dion. Hal., de comp. verb. chap. 26. *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐμμελοῦς καὶ ἐμμέτρου συνθέσεως τῆς ἐχούσης πολλὴν ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὴν πεζὴν λέξιν τοιαῦτά τινα λέγειν ἔχω· ὡς πρώτη μὲν ἐστὶν αἰτία κἀνταῦθα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅνπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμέτρου ποιητικῆς, ἣ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν ἀρμογὴ· δευτέρα δέ, ἣ τῶν κώλων σύνθεσις· τρίτη δέ, ἣ τῶν περιόδων ἐμμετρία (συμμετρία, Roberts with M). τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει κατορθοῦν τὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια, δεῖ πολυειδῶς στρέφειν τε καὶ συναρμώττειν, καὶ τὰ κῶλα ἐν διαστήμασι ποιεῖν συμμέτρως, μὴ συναπαρτίζοντα τοῖς στίχοις, ἀλλὰ διατέμνοντα τὸ μέτρον, ἀνισά τε ποιεῖν αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνόμοια· πολλὰκις δὲ*

²⁷ Op. cit., 297; Engelbrecht thinks (without good reason, in the opinion of the present writer) that a pause in sense is indicated in Arist. (l. c.), in Ps.-Draco, p. 126, and in the Tractatus Harleianus, p. 10.

²⁸ Op. cit., where considerable importance is attached to the definition given by the Great Anonymus.

²⁹ Cf. once more the use of *semper* in Mar. Vict., and of *πάντως* by the Great Anonymus, with reference to completion of the thought at B.

καὶ εἰς κόμματα συνάγειν βραχύτερα κώλων, τὰς τε περιόδους μήτε ἰσομεγέθεις μήτε ὁμοιοσχήμονας τὰς γούν παρακειμένας ἀλλήλαις ἐργάζεσθαι.

ὣν δὲ προϋθέμην τὰ παραδείγματα θείς, αὐτοῦ κατακλείσω τὸν λόγον. ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐπικῆς ποιήσεως ταῦτ' ἀπόχρη (ξ 1-7).

αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἐκ λιμένος προσέβη τρηχεῖαν ἀταρπόν·

ἐν μὲν δὴ τοῦτο κῶλον. ἕτερον δὲ

χῶρον ἀν' ὑλήεντα·—

ἔλαττόν τε τοῦ προτέρου, καὶ δίχα τέ μιν οὖν στίχον. τρίτον δὲ τοῦτι

—δι' ἄκριας·—

ἔλαττον κώλου κομμάτιον.

—ἦ οἱ Ἀθήνη

πέφραδε δῖον ὑφορβόν·—

ἐξ ἡμιστιχίων δύο συγκείμενον, καὶ τοῖς προτέροις οὐδὲν εἰκόσ. ἔπειτα τὸ τελευταῖον·

—ὃ οἱ βιότοιο μάλιστα

κήδετο οἰκῶν, οὓς κτήσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς·

ἀτελῇ μὲν τὸν τρίτον ποιοῦν στίχον, τοῦ δὲ τετάρτου τῇ προσθήκῃ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἀφρηγμένον. ἔπειτ' αὖθις

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ εὖρ' ἤμενον·

οὐ συνεκτρέχον οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῷ στίχῳ.

—ἔνθα οἱ αὐλῇ

ὑψηλῇ δέδμητο·—

ἄνισον καὶ τοῦτο τῷ προτέρῳ. κᾶπειτα ὁ ἐξῆς νοῦς ἀπερίοδος ἐν κώλοις τε καὶ κόμμασι λεγόμενος· ἐπιθείς γὰρ

—περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ·

πάλιν ἐποίησει

καλὴ τε μεγάλη τε—

βραχύτερον κώλου κομμάτιον. εἶτα

—περίδρομος—

ὄνομα καθ' ἑαυτὸ νοῦν τινα ἔχον. εἴθ' ἐξῆς τὰ ἄλλα τὸν αὐτὸν κατασκευάζει τρόπον. τί γὰρ δεῖ μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον;

In this passage we must notice two points, (1) that Dionysius calls attention to the divisions of the hexameter which are made by various short grammatical phrases and units of thought, and (2) that he actually refers twice (lines 9, 18, διατέμνοντα τὸ μέτρον, τέμνον τὸν στίχον) to the 'cutting' of the hexameter

into two sections by the grammatical *κῶλα* and *κόμματα*. It would be easy to apply this observation of Dionysius to the doctrine of the *τομαί* when that doctrine had been fully established, probably sometime during the following century. And this is just what happened, for Hermogenes, who lived about 150 years after Dion., treats the caesura and the pause in sense as of like effect in producing a variation of the rhythm (*περὶ ἰδεῶν*, p. 394, 18 Rabe) *ἐξίσταται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ οἰκείου πολλάκις τὸ μέτρον ῥυθμοῦ κατὰ τὰς ποιὰς τῶν στίχων τομὰς καὶ ἀναπαύσεις ἐννοιῶν κατὰ τὰ κῶλα. τὸ γοῦν*

(*ἡρώων* ·) αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλῶρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν

ἀναπαιστικόν πῶς ἔστιν, γενομένης ἀναπαύσεως ἐν τῷ 'ἡρώων'. We cannot be absolutely certain that Hermogenes regarded *τομή* as a pause in sense, but the probabilities are that he did. The pause after *ἡρώων* is not a *τομή*, for the triemimeral caesura was not recognized as early as 150 A. D., but only an *ἀνάπαυσις ἐννοίας*, and Hermogenes gives no other illustration of the influence of *τομή* and pause in sense upon the rhythm. But at least we may conclude that in the use of 'caesura' and 'pause in sense' together a second step had been taken towards the establishment of the theory of the logical caesura.

While rhetoricians were noticing the *cola* and *commata*, the variety in their arrangement, and their effect upon the rhythm of the Homeric verse, the pauses in the thought of Homeric poetry were being examined from another point of view by Nicanor, the Punctuator (*ὁ Στιγματίας ἐπικληθείς*, Eustathius, 20, 12), a contemporary of Hadrian. No reference to caesura is found in any of the fragments which may be referred with certainty to Nicanor. The latter, however, notes the frequency of punctuation at the places where the metricians place the *τομαί*. Furthermore, there is a scholium (on A 356; Friedländer, Nicanor, 129) in which it is stated that *τομή* is rare after the *ἔβδομος χρόνος* (the first short syllable of the second foot). This mention of *ἔβδομος χρόνος* is a sure sign of Nicanor, or at least of his doctrine. Friedländer holds that the scholium cannot be the work of Nicanor, for the latter could not have meant that a caesura was rare at this point in the verse, since a word ends with the first short syllable of the second foot in 21 of the first 100 verses of the Iliad, and in 10 of the first 100

of the Odyssey. This reasoning is hardly sound, for—aside from the fact that Friedländer begs the question of what a caesura is—no *τομή* was recognized, as we have seen, in the first two feet of the verse, at least, as early as Nicanor. Rauscher (de scholiis Homericis ad rem metricam pertinentibus, Strassburg, 1886, 30 f.) assigns the statement to Nicanor, but emends by reading *στιγμή* for *τομή*, since punctuation, although found with varying degrees of frequency elsewhere in the first two feet of the hexameter, is in fact rare after the second trochee.³⁰ This emendation is unnecessary. The inference is rather that by the time of the scholiast caesura had come to mean, at least among the rhetorical writers, a pause in sense sufficient for punctuation. The scholium cannot belong to Nicanor, for the doctrine that *any* pause in the thought within the verse of Homer is a *τομή* is very late: Joannes Sic., Rhet. Graec. VI 488, Walz, αἱ μὲν οὖν ὀνομασταὶ τομαὶ καὶ γνώριμοι τοσαῦται καὶ αὗται. αἱ δὲ ἀφανεῖς καὶ γανθάνουσαι καὶ ποιῶσαι δοκεῖν τὰ μέτρα περὶ καὶ διάφορα τῷ εἶδει πάμπολλαι· ἐν αἷς γὰρ ἀπαρτίζεται τις ἔννοια καθ' ἑαυτήν, τομαὶ αὗται λέγοντο ἂν εἰκότως.

We may now venture a theory of the origin and development of the doctrine of caesura in ancient times. We have good reason for believing that it arose sometime between the age of Augustus, when it was not known, and that of the Antonines, when it was fully established, that is, it was probably formulated during the first century of the Christian era. We may take it for granted that it originated among the Greek, rather than among the Latin, metricians in view of the nomenclature, *tome*, *bucolice*, *penthemimeres*, etc. If we try to find a Greek metrician who, if not the originator, may at least be regarded with some probability as the sponsor, of the doctrine, three names at once suggest themselves, Philoxenus, Hephaestion and Heliodorus. Of these the first may be discarded at once for lack of evidence. Apparently he had less influence upon later metricians than either of the other two.³¹ Hephaestion, who is thought to have lived about the time of the Antonines, is too late, for Hermogenes refers to the doctrine as if it were already fully established. There remains Heliodorus. He is called

³⁰ Cf. also Rossbach-Westphal, *Metrik*,³ 64 f.

³¹ Gleditsch, *Metrik*,³ 71.

μετρικός by Suidas, and is characterized by Mar. Vict.³² as "inter Graecos huiusce artis antistes aut primus aut solus." Gleditsch assigns the floruit of Heliodorus to about the time of Hadrian. But this is probably too late, for, as Hense has shown,³³ Irenaeus (Minucius Pacatus), a pupil of Heliodorus, is cited in the Hippocratic glossary of Erotian, who lived at the end of the first century. This would make the floruit of Heliodorus about the middle of the first century, A. D.,³⁴ which is exactly the time at which the doctrine of caesura is likely to have arisen. A further reason for thinking that the original sponsor for the doctrine was Heliodorus is the fact that he was especially interested in colometry, and wrote a famous colometric edition of Aristophanes.³⁵ This interest in the *cola* of melic verse might easily have led him to notice, in his work on metric, the *cola* of the hexameter. There is evidence that something like this may have been the case. Hephaestion, in discussing the dactylic meter (Enchiridion, VII), mentions among its various forms πενθημιμερής, ἐφθημιμερής and τετράμετρον (ἀκατάληκτον), and these were the terms, as we have seen, which were regularly applied to the caesurae, P, H, and B. Again, we notice that some of the early metricians regarded τομή as a part of the verse (μόριον, incisum). Finally, Arist., in his description of the caesurae, uses language which in some respects suggests that of Hephaestion when the latter is describing the shorter dactylic meters.³⁶

³² 94, 7, K.: see Gleditsch, l. c.

³³ Cf. Pauly-Wissowa VIII 28 f.

³⁴ It cannot have been much earlier, for Heliodorus himself refers to Seleucus Grammaticus, who lived in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (Hense, in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 28 f., who refers to Leo, Hermes XXIV (1889), 284).

³⁵ Hense, Heliodorische Untersuchungen, 1879; White, op. cit., 384 ff.

³⁶ Hephaestion,

Aristides, 51 f., M.

τῶν δὲ εἰς συλλαβὴν τῷ μὲν
πενθημιμερεὶ πρὸς δύο ποσὶν οὐσῶν
τῶν συλλαβῶν Ἀρχιλοχὸς κέχρηται
(Cap. vii).

τῷ δὲ ἐφθημιμερεὶ Ἀλκμάν (ibid).
δεῖ δὲ τὸ ἐλεγείον τέμνεσθαι
πάντως καθ' ἕτερον τῶν πενθημιμερῶν
(Cap. xv, 8).

πρώτη μὲν (sc. τομή) ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας
εἰς συλλαβήν.

τρίτη δὲ μετὰ τρεῖς εἰς συλλαβήν.
ἢ (= πενθημιμερὲς τομή) καὶ διπλασιαζο-
μένη ποιεῖ τὸ ἐλεγείον.

The suggestion that the doctrine of caesura may have been formulated first by Heliodorus of course admits of no proof, and after all is of slight importance in comparison with the question of the signification of caesura in the ancient metric. This may be summarized as follows:

(1) At first the caesurae were parts of the hexameter, not the ends of parts.

(2) These parts were made to correspond to recognized dactylic measures, the shortest of which was the trimeter catalectic ending in one syllable (= the *πενθήμερὲς* of Hephaestion VII).³⁷

(3) In applying this doctrine the frequency of T was noticed, and a new *τομή* was added. This did not correspond to a recognized dactylic measure, and perhaps for this reason seems to have been regarded quite generally as of somewhat less importance than either P or H.

(4) Some time before Aristides, the so-called bucolic diaeresis was discarded by some unknown metrician. As tradition required four caesurae—or for some other reason—the fourth trochaic caesura was substituted. It is not supported by the facts of Homeric versification, but corresponds to a dactylic measure, for Hephaestion (VII) tells us that the dactylic tetrameter catalectic ending in two syllables was employed by Archilochus.

(5) The caesura came into prominence by reason of its analogy to the metrical units which are found within the hexameter, but later, as the doctrine was passed on from one metrician to another, it came to mean, not a part of the verse, but the ending of a word within the third or fourth foot, or else at the end of the fourth foot. Whether caesura was felt to be a real pause greater than at the end of a word in any other place in the verse will be discussed later (p. 368). At all events *ancient metricians who do not regard a pause in the thought as essential to caesura never call a caesura a pause.*

(6) Caesura as a pause in sense does not belong to the earlier doctrine. It arose largely, if not solely, from the grammatical

³⁷ The Adonius is not recognized as a verse by Hephaestion, and, moreover, a word-end after the second foot of the hexameter is avoided. That the triemimeral received no consideration is explained by the fact that the dactylic dimeter catalectic is not found as a distinct verse.

and rhetorical study of Homer, and was not incorporated into the metrical doctrine until later.

It remains to examine the ancient sources with reference to the effect of caesura upon the rhythm of the verse. Unfortunately, the evidence—which agrees with the facts of versification in all languages belonging to the same branch as the Greek and Latin, although not with all theories of caesura—is late, fragmentary and far from clear. We may distinguish two theories:

(1) The caesura produces a change in the rhythm, e. g., from dactylic to anapaestic.³⁸ This theory is found only in Hermogenes, in two passages of his work,

καὶ μέτρων διαφόρους τομὰς, ἐξ ὧν καὶ διάφορά πως συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι τὰ μέτρα καὶ ταῦτα ἐν δέοντι καὶ κατὰ λόγον μεταβαλλόμενα (390, Rabe).

ἐξίσταται γὰρ τοῦ οἰκείου πολλάκις τὸ μέτρον ῥυθμοῦ κατὰ τὰς ποιὰς τῶν στίχων τομὰς καὶ ἀναπαύσεις ἐννοιῶν κατὰ τὰ κῶλα (394, Rabe).

(2) Caesura makes the verse 'lighter,' that is, less like prose, by avoiding the monotonous coincidence of word-ends and metrical feet: Priscian, Gram. Lat. III 460, 16, caesurae vero cursum et rhythmum leviores solent facere, et necesse est vel unam vel duas caesuras in versu inveniri. nam tres rarissime possunt in eodem versu esse. The bearing of the second part of this statement is important, for if two, and sometimes three, of the four recognized caesurae may be found in the same verse, caesura cannot be a distinct pause in the thought. Priscian is not alone in admitting more than a single caesura in the same verse. We have seen that Mar. Vict. allows P, H, and B in one verse, and that in a Byzantine treatise P, T, H and B are all illustrated by a single example.³⁹ To these passages we may add one from Diomedes (498, 15 ff. K.), hae incisiones, quas Graeci tomas appellunt, figuris formantur tribus, simplici composita conjuncta. simplex est cum invenitur una incisio, ut est

panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi—P.

composita cum duae inveniuntur, ut est

³⁸ Cf. Seymour, *Homeric Language and Verse*, 86.

³⁹ Pp. 357, 356.

infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem—T. and H.
conjuncta ⁴⁰ cum tres inveniuntur,⁴¹ ut est

talibus Ilioneus, cuncti simul ore fremebant—P, H and B.

The 'lightening of the rhythm' by conflict between word and metrical foot was thought to be more necessary in the middle of the verse than towards the beginning or the end: Aul. Gell., XVIII 15, in longis versibus, qui 'hexametri' vocantur, item in senariis, animadverterunt metrici primos duos pedes, item extremos duos, habere singulos posse integras partes orationis, medios haut umquam posse, sed constare eos semper ex verbis aut divisis aut mixtis atque confusis (then follows the observation of Varro, cited above, p. 348, note 7).

These passages and the description of the various caesurae

⁴⁰ A slightly different definition of the figura conjuncta is found in the catechetical fragment de metris et de hexametro heroico of a certain Victorinus, who is to be distinguished alike from Mar. Vict. and from Max. Vict. (Gram. Lat. VI 214, 23; cf. Beda, Gram. Lat. VII 245, 17): Quot sunt species in caesura hexametri versus? Quattuor. Quae sunt? Conjunctus districtus mixtus divisus. Conjunctus qui est? Qui in scandendo ita concatenatus est sibi, ut nusquam finito sensu divisa inter se verba ponantur, quod genus versificationis laudabile habetur, ac melius, ut puta veluti est

infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem,

that is, the sense must not be complete at any point in the verse, and the words must be so placed as not to end with any of the metrical feet. This definition, when taken in connection with the passage from Diomedes and with a statement of Priscian in the passage from which citation has just been made, contains the only justification which is to be found in our ancient sources for the theory that caesura is, as some modern scholars hold, the cutting of any foot by a word-end. The words of Priscian are as follows: quarta enim (caesura) bucolica, sicut hemiepes et quarta trochaica et quae inveniuntur per singulos pedes.

⁴¹ The ancient statements that more than one caesura may be found in the same verse have given rise in modern times to the controversy over the position of the 'main caesura' (e. g., Masqueray, op. cit., 48-50), and to the arbitrary and confusing terms which are used, especially by German scholars, to describe 'main' and 'subordinate' caesurae: 'podic' and 'rhythmic' (Munk); 'primariae' and 'ordinariae' (Koechly); 'maiores' and 'minores' (Ströhler); 'Versabschnitt' and 'Verseinschnitt' (Lehrs and Engelbrecht); 'Hauptcäsur,' 'Nebencäsur' and 'Ersatzcäsur' (Meyer), etc. It may be added that the terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' as applied to caesura have no ancient authority.

which have been quoted in the discussion of the ancient doctrine of the metrical caesura (p. 355), seem to show that the ancient *metricians* regarded caesura, not as a pause, but as a conflict between word and foot in certain preferred places in the verse. This is put beyond reasonable doubt by a passage in Eustathius (ad Iliad., IX 122, p. 740, 1 ff.) :

ἔπτ' ἀπύρους τρίποδας, δέκα δὲ χρυσοῖο τάλαντα,
αἰθωνας δὲ λέβητας ἑξήκοσι, δώδεκα δ' ἵππους.

τούτων δὲ τῶν στίχων ἑκατέρου ἢ εἰς δύο ἐννοίας τομὴ οὐ πάνυ μετρικῶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἳ φασιν ὅτι τὸ μέτρον χαίρει μὲν συνδεσμεῖσθαι τοὺς πόδας ἀλλήλοις, ὡς κατὰ μῆδεν εἰς μέρος ἀπαρτίζειν λόγον, οἶον

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσε.

παρατεῖται δὲ ὡς περ τὸ κατὰ πόδα τέμνεσθαι, οἶον

Ἰβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ' ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.

οὕτω καὶ τὴν δίχα τομὴν ἡγουν τὴν εἰς δύο ἐννοίας, ὡς τὸ

ἔνθ' οὗτ' Ἰδομενεὺς τλῆ μῖμνεν, οὗτ' Ἀγαμέμνων.

οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν τριχῇ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείον διαίρεσιν. ῥυθμικὰ γάρ φασιν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ μετρικά. οὐκοῦν καὶ τὰ ῥηθέντα δύο ἔπη ῥυθμικώτερον διάκειται. "The early metricians admired the verse in which there was conflict throughout between words and metrical feet,⁴² and disliked equally the absence of conflict and a pause in the thought which divides the verse into two or three equal parts. This division, they asserted, is a matter of 'rhythm' rather than of meter. Hence verses like Iliad IX 122 f., which contain one or more pauses in sense, are better 'rhythmically' than 'metrically.'" If the sharp distinction between ῥυθμικά and μετρικά correctly preserves the tradition of the παλαιοὶ μετρικοί, we must conclude that the *τομή* of the metricians was in no sense a pause, and further, that the only pauses which were made in the oral rendering of the Homeric poems, at least during the early centuries of the Christian era, were those which were required by the meaning of the words, and which were natural in giving proper attention to the expression of the thought of the poet.

⁴² Cf. Mar. Vict. 71, 3, K., *metrorum fere omnium natura talis est, ut caveant ne singulas partes orationis singulorum pedum fine concludant, sed potius ut verba vel nomina ex residua sui parte sequentibus pedibus adnectant, quo pacto evenit* vocum integer pes esse, sed sane ut perfectae parti orationis de sequenti sermone aliquid accedat, nec umquam facile cum fine pedis pars orationis impleatur.*

Whether this holds true for the earlier recitation of the Homeric poems is a question which is more difficult to answer. Some of the points in the problem which this question presents have already been touched upon, and a fuller discussion of them, and of others, is impossible in this paper. They do not seem to the present writer to be of sufficient weight to justify us in believing that caesura, even if it had been recognized in the fifth century B. C., for example, and even earlier, after the poems had ceased to be sung, would have had any other significance than it had in the doctrine of the *μετρικοί*.

This conclusion, to which the writer has been led by a careful study of the sources, in spite of a preconceived notion of caesura as nothing but a pause in thought, does not prevent us from making a pause at a caesura, nor from dividing the verse into two *cola* by such a pause. But it does make the converse impossible. For if caesura is not a pause, but only a conflict between the words and the metrical feet, *we have no right to make a pause in the third or the fourth foot of the hexameter unless this pause is justified by the thought of the poet*. Still less can we mark the end of a rhythmical *colon* always (with Lehrs), or whenever a word-end occurs (Masqueray and others) after the first or second syllable of the third foot. But we must guard against the assumption that adherence to the theory of caesura as a matter of metrical conflict nullifies the value of the studies which have been made in the relation between the caesurae and Homeric language, versification, relation of thought to the parts of the verse, and the kind of words which are most frequently found or avoided before and after caesurae. The results of such studies, which are of the greatest value for the appreciation of the poet's technique, are as valid as ever. The only modification which is necessary is in the terms in which the reasons for these results are expressed.

The writer is far from claiming to have removed all the difficulties from the complicated problem which is presented by the doctrine of the Homeric caesura. But these principles seem to have been more or less clearly established by the foregoing discussion :

1. Caesura was not recognized in the classic period of Greek literature.

2. Rhythmical caesura, i. e., a pause or hold which marks the end of the first of two rhythmical or musical *cola* without regard to the sense, is not supported by evidence which is sufficient to justify us in making such a pause or hold in the oral rendering of the Homeric poems.

3. Logical caesura, or a pause in sense at certain preferred places in the verse, is not caesura at all according to the most widely accepted meaning of the term in ancient times. It was a misapplication of the term which was due to the rhetoricians.

4. Caesura belongs to the purely metrical doctrine, *and does not mean a pause.*

We may put the results of our study more briefly by saying that we have rejected the doctrine of the rhythmical caesura as unsupported by the evidence; that we do not call a pause in sense 'caesura,' and that caesura is merely a matter of word-ends, and does not imply a pause. This position requires further elucidation. According to it, caesura is a metrical phenomenon, and in its widest application (which the ancients did not fully recognize, because the doctrine arose from the observation that certain shorter verses were contained within the hexameter) constitutes one of the two fundamental principles of structure which distinguish recitative poetry from prose.⁴³ Both of these principles have to do with the opposition which exists in poetry between law or sameness on the one hand, and freedom or variety on the other—the eternal conflict between the one and the many, the former being represented by the metrical or the rhythmical scheme, the latter by the words of the poem. In the heroic hexameter, which, unlike melic meters, is never used together with other measures, the monotony which would result from the constant repetition of precisely the same scheme is partly avoided by the interchange of dactyls and spondees in the 32 *σχήματα*, but the underlying framework of the verse is as rigid as that of the Doric temple. Upon this frame must be arranged the words which represent the poet's thought. The simplest arrangement which immediately suggests itself, is that in which the grammatical sentence or clause exactly fills the

⁴³ Cf. Charlton A. Lewis, *The Principles of English Verse*, 1906, to which the writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness for valuable suggestions. See also Sidney Colvin, *Keats* (in *Morley's Makers of Literature*), chap. II.

verse and has no break in the thought, and the words of the sentence fill each a metrical foot. But this is impracticable because of the nature of the language and the modes of thought; it is likewise not poetry, for it lacks the important element of art, or adaptation to the underlying form. Hence arise the two principles (1) of variation from the rhythmical norm, and (2) of conflict between the words and the metrical feet. The first of these principles has nothing to do with the meter, that is, with the arrangement of the syllables in feet, but rather with the rhythm of the verse, which depends on the length of the time intervals. The rhythmical norm of the hexameter consists of six equal groups of four *χρόνοι πρῶτοι* each, and rhythmical variety is obtained by pauses or holds. In music these are either of definite length, which may be indicated by arbitrary signs, or else they are unmeasurable departures from the precise rhythm which are due to what is called expression or phrasing. In recitative poetry a similar variation results from making a grammatical *colon* or *comma* or still shorter phrase end at some place other than the close of the verse, and from the use of that emotional element of the spoken language which we call emphasis. This rhythmical variety is concerned with the poet's thought and with the meaning of the words, rather than with their form. But the words themselves, aside from the meaning which they convey, offer the opportunity for variety of a different kind, which is the result, as has been intimated, of a conflict between their length and position in the verse, and the six schematic feet which form the underlying framework of the hexameter. In the series between perfect agreement with this metrical scheme and absolute disagreement there are an endless number of partial agreements and partial conflicts. This principle of conflict or agreement was embraced under the broad term 'caesura' as used by Priscian, and 'τομή' of the ancient metricians whom Eustathius cites. But 'caesura' as a technical term of the great majority of ancient writers whose works have come down to us, denoted the positions in the verse, after the first two feet,⁴⁴ in which metrical conflict (or agreement) was most desired.

⁴⁴ The reason for the failure of the metricians to notice caesura in the first two feet has been indicated above (p. 365, note 37). This is of course an entirely different question from the one which concerns the

It has often been said that the perfection of art consists in a balance between two opposing principles of law and freedom, or of sameness and variety. In the Homeric verse, as we have said, the principle of sameness is represented by the underlying scheme of the single measure which is employed. The principle of variety is illustrated by the σχήματα; by the choice of very long or very short words in sequence; by the occurrence of word-ends in all possible places within the verse, with a single exception,⁴⁵ and, finally, by the freedom with which the thought not only at times disregards the natural place for a pause, which is at the end of the verse, but is also complete at so many points within the verse. The fixed scheme, which represents the principle of law, is never forgotten, but with the love of freedom which is native in the Ionian artist, the Homeric poet inclines a little towards the side of variety, thereby adding to the beauty of his poetry. Those who would always make a pause at the 'caesura' of the third (or fourth) foot, overlook this important characteristic of Homeric verse. Yet a comparison of Homer with the later epic poets by means of stylometric tests which have to do with the adaptation of words and thought to the metrical scheme shows that it is Homer who is the lover of freedom, and that the later poets tend to abandon somewhat the principle of variety, and to restrict the possibilities of deviation from the fixed underlying scheme. In ancient times the superiority of Homer in this respect was recognized by Hermogenes, and is put most clearly with reference to the caesurae and the pauses in sense by his commentator, Joannes Siceliotes (498, Walz). The commentator confused caesura with the pause in the sense, calling *τομή* now a word-end, later, a pause in the thought, and still again a pause sufficient for punctuation, but he is clear in his conclusion: *καὶ διὰ οὖν τὰς διαφόρους τομὰς ἄριστος ποιητῶν Ὁμηρος.*

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

poet's reason for desiring or avoiding conflict or agreement in this or in any other part of the verse.

⁴⁵ The 'fourth trochaic' caesura, where a word-end is found so rarely that it may be said to have been forbidden.